

Joseph R. Saveri (*pro hac vice*)  
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.  
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1210  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com

Richard A. Koffman (*pro hac vice*)  
COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL, PLLC  
1100 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 500, East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 408-4600  
Facsimile: (202) 408-4699  
rkoffman@cohenmilstein.com

Eric L. Cramer (*pro hac vice*)  
BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.  
1622 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 875-3000  
Facsimile: (215) 875-4604  
ecramer@bm.net

*Co-lead Class Counsel and Attorneys for Individual and  
Representative Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, and Jon Fitch,  
Brandon Vera, Luis Javier Vazquez, and Kyle Kingsbury*

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, and Jon Fitch,  
Brandon Vera, Luis Javier Vazquez, and Kyle  
Kingsbury, on behalf of themselves and all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Zuffa, LLC, d/b/a Ultimate Fighting  
Championship and UFC,

Defendant.

No.: 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-(PAL)

PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO  
COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS  
WITHHELD ON PRIVILEGE GROUNDS  
AND FOR OTHER RELIEF

DATE: July 13, 2017  
TIME: 9:30 AM

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND. ....	3
A. Zuffa has Failed to Follow Rule 26 with Respect to Assertion of Privilege Claims.....	3
B. Plaintiffs' Efforts to Meet and Confer and Resolve Privilege Claims without Court Intervention. ....	4
1. Meet and Confer Efforts. ....	4
2. Zuffa Agrees to Conduct Another Review of Withheld Documents and to Produce a Revised Privilege Log. ....	6
3. Plaintiffs' Efforts to Narrow the Dispute. ....	6
4. Zuffa's History of Asserting and Maintaining Improper Privilege and Work Product Claims. ....	6
III. ZUFFA'S IMPROPER PRIVILEGE CLAIMS HAVE FRUSTRATED PLAINTIFFS' DISCOVERY AND PREJUDICED PLAINTIFFS. ....	8
IV. ARGUMENT .....	9
A. Legal Standard. ....	9
B. Zuffa's Late Production of an Inadequate Privilege Log Waives Its Privilege Claims. ....	10
C. Zuffa's Privilege Log Fails to Provide Sufficient Facts for Plaintiffs to Assess Zuffa's Claims of Privilege. ....	12
D. The Court Should Set a Procedure for Future Privilege Challenges. ....	13
V. CONCLUSION .....	14

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

**Cases**

<i>Bowne, Inc. v. AmBase Corp.</i> , 150 F.R.D. 465 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) .....	8
<i>Bullion Monarch Mining, Inc. v. Newmont USA Ltd.</i> , 271 F.R.D. 643 (D. Nev. 2010) .....	11
<i>Burlington N. &amp; Santa Fe Ry. v. United States Dist. Court</i> , 408 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 2005).....	passim
<i>Clarke v. Am. Commerce Nat'l Bank</i> , 974 F.2d 127 (9th Cir. 1992).....	9
<i>Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69813 (D. Nev. May 26, 2016) .....	5, 6, 7
<i>Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20614 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2017).....	5, 6, 7, 12
<i>Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89293 (D. Nev. June 9, 2017).....	5, 6, 7
<i>Diamond State Ins. Co. v. Rebel Oil Co.</i> , 157 F.R.D. 691 (D. Nev. 1994) .....	3, 9
<i>Gashtili v. JB Carter Props. II, LLC</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 159076 (D. Nev. Oct. 30, 2013).....	9
<i>In re Fluidmaster, Inc.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154618 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 8, 2016) .....	13
<i>In re Rivastigmine Patent Litig.</i> , 237 F.R.D. 69 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) .....	7
<i>In re Vioxx Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 501 F. Supp. 2d 789 (E.D. La. 2007).....	2, 14
<i>Miller v. Pancucci</i> , 141 F.R.D. 292 (C.D. Cal. 1992) .....	9
<i>Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 151 F.R.D. 118 (D. Nev. 1993) .....	3, 9
<i>Phillips v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 290 F.R.D. 615 (D. Nev. 2013) .....	12
<i>Phx. Ins. Co. v. Your Vitamins, Inc.</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15479 (D. Nev. Feb. 5, 2013).....	12
<i>Progressive Cas. Ins. Co. v. FDIC</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32654 (D. Nev. Mar. 11, 2014) .....	11
<i>RKF Retail Holdings, LLC v. Tropicana Las Vegas, Inc.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80436 (D. Nev. May 25, 2017) .....	8
<i>Saud v. California</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66238 (E.D. Cal. May 18, 2016).....	9
<i>United States v. Chevron Texaco Corp.</i> , 241 F. Supp. 2d 1065 (N.D. Cal. 2002) .....	9, 12
<i>Vioxx Prods. Liab. Litig. Steering Comm. v. Merck &amp; Co.</i> , 2006 U.S. App. LEXIS 27587 (5th Cir. May 25, 2006) .....	14

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5).....	3
-------------------------------	---

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont.)**

1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5)(A) .....8

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## I. INTRODUCTION

Zuffa continues to frustrate Plaintiffs’ discovery through improper claims of privilege or work product. Zuffa has withheld over 30,000 documents on the basis of privilege and failed to provide a privilege log that identifies these documents or discloses the basis for privilege until April 2017—at the very end of discovery. Moreover, the boilerplate descriptions in the latest version of the privilege log Zuffa only recently provided are insufficient to support a claim of privilege. Zuffa has thus waived any privilege that may have existed, and its eleventh-hour attempts to cure those deficiencies are now too little and too late. *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. v. United States Dist. Court*, 408 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 2005) (“*Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry.*”).

As Zuffa now tacitly admits, its privilege claims are overbroad and incorrect. Zuffa has agreed to withdraw an as-yet undisclosed number of privilege claims as to an as-yet unidentified and still not produced number of relevant discoverable documents. *See* Declaration of Matthew S. Weiler (“Weiler Decl.”), Exh. 12. In addition, Zuffa has acknowledged the inadequacy of the required privilege log descriptions of documents withheld and agreed to conduct another review of the documents withheld and to provide a revised log. *Id.* This should have been done in the first instance. And it should have been done months—if not years—ago. While these attempts to cure are a step in the right direction and should be completed at once, this motion is necessary now in order to address (1) the timeliness and adequacy of Zuffa’s description of the withheld documents; and (2) a schedule and process for resolving disputes about particular documents without further delay and prejudice.

Despite numerous efforts to obtain non-privileged documents Zuffa has withheld, Zuffa still has only produced documents in dribs and drabs. *See, e.g.*, Weiler Decl., Exh. 13. To date, there are still responsive documents Zuffa has not yet produced even though Zuffa admits that its privilege claims were incorrect with respect to—at least—hundreds of documents. The Court should order Zuffa to produce these documents without delay.

With respect to the other documents withheld despite Plaintiffs’ diligence, the Court should determine that Zuffa’s withholding of materials under improper claims of privilege, combined with Zuffa’s failures to take necessary steps to disclose and protect materials pursuant to Rule 26, constitutes a waiver of privilege claims. *See Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry.*, 408 F.3d at 1149 (holding that untimely

1 production of privilege log with boilerplate assertions of privilege constituted waiver). Zuffa has not  
 2 only abused the discovery process but done so in a way that puts Plaintiffs in the unfair and prejudicial  
 3 position of having to proceed with discovery without the benefit of potentially key documentary  
 4 evidence.

5 The remedy for such behavior is clear and straightforward, even if severe. The Court should  
 6 enter an order denying Zuffa's claims of privilege as to all documents. *See Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry.*,  
 7 408 F.3d at 1149 ("Here, the district court found a waiver where the log not only was not filed during  
 8 the Rule 34 time limit, but was filed *five months* later.") (emphasis in original). On June 9, 2015, Zuffa  
 9 served their responses and objections to Plaintiffs' first request for production of documents. *See Weiler*  
 10 Decl., ¶ 3. Zuffa did not even attempt to identify a detailed basis for its privilege assertions **until nearly**  
 11 **two years later**, on April 7, 2017, when it first produced an inadequate privilege log. *Id.*, ¶ 4, Exh. 1.  
 12 That effort was materially deficient and, as of today, it still has not been cured. All of the factors  
 13 identified by the *Burlington* court are present here. A finding of waiver is justified.

14 Alternatively, Plaintiffs request immediate remedial steps, including but not limited to an order  
 15 requiring that Zuffa (1) produce all documents improperly withheld without delay; and (2) produce a  
 16 privilege log within five days that adequately sets forth the basis for the claim of privilege under Rule 26  
 17 for the 17,274 withheld documents that are obviously most relevant to Plaintiffs' case. In addition,  
 18 Plaintiffs request that the Court set forth an expedited procedure for adjudicating any disputed claims  
 19 with respect to withheld documents identified on any revised privilege log. *See In re Vioxx Prods. Liab.*  
 20 *Litig.*, 501 F. Supp. 2d 789, 790-91 (E.D. La. 2007) (discussing implementation of procedure for  
 21 resolving disputed privilege claims pursuant to order of Fifth Circuit).<sup>1</sup>

22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26 <sup>1</sup> In light of the impending close of discovery, and in the interest of efficiency and the preservation of the  
 27 Court's and the parties' resources, Plaintiffs respectfully ask that that the Court hear this motion at the  
 28 Status Conference currently scheduled for July 13, 2017. Plaintiffs propose that the Court adopt an  
 expedited briefing schedule under which Zuffa's response would be due on July 10. Plaintiffs will forego  
 submitting a reply.

## II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.

### A. Zuffa has Failed to Follow Rule 26 with Respect to Assertion of Privilege Claims.

Plaintiffs served their first request for production of documents on April 26, 2015. Weiler Decl., ¶ 3. Zuffa served objections on June 9, 2015, consisting largely of boilerplate objections. *Id.* On September 23, 2016, Zuffa informed the Court that it had previously substantially completed its document production on September 1, 2016. ECF No. 297 at 2. Throughout its rolling production of documents, Zuffa failed to provide a privilege log.<sup>2</sup> Weiler Decl., ¶ 4.

It was not until April 7, 2017, less than two months before the discovery cutoff, that Zuffa produced a privilege log. Weiler Decl., ¶ 4. That log contained 30,037 entries. *Id.* Prior to that date, Zuffa did not provide Plaintiffs any notice of the number of discoverable documents withheld. *Id.* Zuffa has not asserted—and does not assert—that a document-by-document log of documents withheld in whole or in part is unduly burdensome. Following Plaintiffs’ initial review and identification of deficiencies, Zuffa amended its privilege log on April 24. That version, which is the latest iteration, includes 30,092 entries. Weiler Decl., ¶ 6, Exhs. 3-4.

The log, even in its current incarnation, is facially inadequate. *See* Rule 26(b)(5) (“the party must: (i) expressly make the claim; and (ii) describe the nature of the documents, communications, or tangible things not produced or disclosed”). Zuffa repeatedly sets forth uninformative boilerplate descriptions of the documents withheld. Typical examples include: (1) “[e]mail chain discussing legal advice regarding fighter contracts”; (2) “[e]mail chain providing legal advice regarding acquisitions”; and (3) “[e]mail providing legal advice regarding corporate matters.” *See* Weiler Decl., Exh. 4. These descriptions do not satisfy Rule 26(b)(5)’s requirement that Zuffa describe the nature of the documents in a way that will allow Plaintiffs to assess the basis of the privilege claim. *See e.g., Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, 151 F.R.D. 118, 122 n. 6 (D. Nev. 1993) (“General Electric’s log does not provide the names of intended recipients and others with access to the document, nor does it identify the documents or their subject matter with a reasonable degree of specificity.”); *Diamond State Ins. Co. v.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Zuffa’s representations about the status of the completion of its production were inaccurate. Zuffa continued to produce documents on a rolling basis throughout late 2016 and into 2017, including a production of 4,236 documents on March 11, 2017. Weiler Decl., ¶ 3.

1 *Rebel Oil Co.*, 157 F.R.D. 691, 699 (D. Nev. 1994) (“self-serving conclusory statements” and a “a vague  
2 description of the documents” are insufficient to demonstrate a document is privileged).

3 **B. Plaintiffs’ Efforts to Meet and Confer and Resolve Privilege Claims without Court  
4 Intervention.**

5 **1. Meet and Confer Efforts.**

6 Plaintiffs have met and conferred with Zuffa for more than a month on privilege issues. Weiler  
7 Decl. ¶¶ 5-11. On April 20, 2017, Plaintiffs sent Zuffa a letter addressing the inadequacy of the  
8 descriptions of the documents and asking for descriptions in compliance with Rule 26. Weiler Decl.,  
9 Exh. 2. Plaintiffs asked Zuffa to correct these and other deficiencies by April 24. On April 24, 2017,  
10 Zuffa produced the amended version of the privilege log that included more information—metadata  
11 regarding document recipients—but did not address the deficient document descriptions. Weiler Decl.,  
12 ¶ 6.<sup>3</sup>

13 Through this process, it has become clear that Zuffa’s privilege log contained at least hundreds,  
14 if not thousands, of non-privileged documents. Plaintiffs have identified a number of these documents  
15 to Zuffa, and Zuffa has conceded that many of these documents are not privileged. Weiler Decl. ¶¶ 8-9,  
16 15. Additionally, Zuffa has continued to produce small batches of documents to Plaintiffs that Zuffa  
17 concedes it improperly withheld. Weiler Decl. ¶ 15, Exh. 13. As part of this back and forth, Plaintiffs  
18 have also specifically identified from the log more than 150 additional documents that are obviously not  
19 privileged and have asked Zuffa to validate its claims of privilege or produce the documents. Weiler  
20 Decl., ¶ 12.

21 Now, after years of discovery and weeks before the discovery cutoff, Zuffa has agreed to conduct  
22 a review of the documents identified in the privilege log. Weiler Decl. ¶ 14, Exh. 12.

23 Based on the privilege logs produced to date, Zuffa has improperly withheld numerous  
24 documents, including many documents that contain discussions of pure business issues, such as the  
25 compensation amounts and number of bouts being offered to a given fighter. *See e.g.*, Weiler Decl., Exhs.

26  
27 <sup>3</sup> Zuffa has sporadically produced some documents previously withheld—frequently after prompting  
28 from Plaintiffs—and has revised a very small subset of its privilege log entries to include more detail  
about the nature of the communication and the privilege asserted. Weiler Decl., Exh. 7 (Evan North  
Letter to Matthew Weiler, May 25, 2017).



14, 15, 16 (ZFL-2606831, ZFL-2633056, ZFL-1021815). Pursuant to prior orders of the Court, such materials are discoverable and not privileged. *See, Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69813 (D. Nev. May 26, 2016); *Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20614, at \*15-16 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2017); *Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89293 (D. Nev. June 9, 2017).

On May 21, 2017, Plaintiffs sent Zuffa a letter stating that with respect to Lawrence Epstein the privilege log still contained far too little descriptive detail to enable Plaintiffs to assess the basis for Zuffa's assertions of privilege, and identifying documents that were improperly redacted. Weiler Decl., Exh. 5 (Matthew Weiler letter to Stacey Grigsby, May 21, 2017). In addition to other requests, Plaintiffs requested additional detail concerning withheld documents relating to Zuffa's acquisitions that were sent or received by Epstein. *Id.* Zuffa conceded that all of the challenged documents were not privileged, along with nine other documents related to acquisitions, but refused to revise the document descriptions, with the exception of a small subset of privilege log entries provided by Plaintiffs. Weiler Decl., Exhs. 6-7 (Stacey Grigsby Letter to Matthew Weiler, May 22, 2017, Evan North email to Matthew Weiler, May 25, 2017).

On June 7, 2017, Plaintiffs sent Zuffa another letter identifying more documents that were clearly not privileged, including documents shared with a third party, thus waiving privilege. Weiler Decl., Exh. 8 (Matthew Weiler letter to Stacey Grigsby, June 7, 2017). Zuffa has not yet responded to this letter.

On June 20, 2017, Plaintiffs met and conferred in person with Zuffa in Washington D.C., and later that day provided Zuffa with a list of disputed redactions for Zuffa to review. Weiler Decl., Exh. 9 (June 20, 2017 Email to Stacey Grigsby, et al.). Plaintiffs also agreed to provide Zuffa with a list of disputed redactions relating to outside Zuffa investor Mubadala, which they subsequently provided to Zuffa on June 28. Weiler Decl., Exh. 10 (Rayhill Email to Evan North, June 28, 2017). Zuffa conceded that virtually all of these documents were non-privileged in a message sent on June 30. *Id.*, Exh. 11.

1                   **2.       Zuffa Agrees to Conduct Another Review of Withheld Documents and to**  
 2                   **Produce a Revised Privilege Log.**

3               On June 24, 2017, Zuffa agreed to “re-review approximately half of the 30,000 documents listed  
 4 on its privilege log.” Weiler Decl., Exh. 12 (Stacey Grigsby Letter to Matthew Weiler, June 24, 2017).  
 5 Additionally, Zuffa agreed that “it will remove the privilege designation or revise the descriptions in the  
 6 privilege log of at least some of these documents.” *Id.* Zuffa agreed that it will produce any documents  
 7 deemed not to be privileged on a rolling basis, with production to be completed by July 10, 2017. *Id.*  
 8 Remarkably, despite its agreement to redo its privilege log, Zuffa maintains that its boilerplate  
 9 uninformative document descriptions satisfy the requirements of Rule 26, and Zuffa does not state it  
 10 will provide sufficient descriptions for all of the documents over which it claims privilege.

11                   **3.       Plaintiffs’ Efforts to Narrow the Dispute.**

12               In order to address the difficulties created by the belated production of a privilege log with more  
 13 than 30,000 entries, Plaintiffs have attempted to narrow the inquiry to approximately 17,000 documents  
 14 of particular import. These appear from the privilege log to be documents regarding fighter contracts,  
 15 acquisitions, “corporate matters,” and communications with outside investor Mubadala. These topics  
 16 go to the core of Plaintiffs’ allegations that Zuffa eliminated competition in the market for promoting  
 17 live Mixed Martial Arts (“MMA”) events by acquiring its competitors, and it exploited its resultant  
 18 monopsony power over fighters to lock the fighters into long-term contracts with highly restrictive  
 19 terms. ECF No. 208, ¶¶ 9, 112-113, 128-129. Given that these materials are of particular importance to  
 20 upcoming discovery and expert work, it is appropriate to focus on these materials.

21                   **4.       Zuffa’s History of Asserting and Maintaining Improper Privilege and Work**  
 22                   **Product Claims.**

23               Zuffa’s privilege logs manifest Zuffa’s strategy of overbroad assertion of privilege, improper  
 24 withholding or redaction of documents, and delaying production until—or after—the court-imposed  
 25 discovery cutoff.

26               In fact, the Court has already considered Zuffa’s assertion of privilege in several contexts before.  
 27 On those occasions, the Court has held, “Zuffa simply had not met its burden of showing the  
 28 documents were privileged.” *Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist.

1 LEXIS 20614, at \*15-16 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2017) (fighter negotiations). *See also, Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*,  
 2 No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69813 (D. Nev. May 26, 2016) (acquisitions); *Cung*  
 3 *Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89293 (D. Nev. June 9, 2017)  
 4 (fighter compensation study).

5 The documents Zuffa has produced show that Zuffa attorneys routinely performed business  
 6 functions and conducted its day-to-day business affairs. Indeed, as shown previously, there are  
 7 numerous examples. For example, documents show Zuffa in-house counsel Michael Mersch took part in  
 8 negotiations with fighters (*Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 9 20614, at \*15-16 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2017)), in-house counsel Lawrence Epstein discussed Zuffa's business  
 10 policies (*Id.*), and outside counsel Thomas Paschall relayed another promoter's negotiating positions  
 11 and discussed Zuffa's acquisition strategy (*Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2016  
 12 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69813 (D. Nev. May 26, 2016)). Moreover, Zuffa commissioned a study of fighter  
 13 compensation through its outside counsel Hunter Campbell, in an unsuccessful effort to insulate  
 14 sensitive and highly relevant business operations from scrutiny in litigation such as this. Weiler Decl.,  
 15 Exhs. 17, 18. (ZFL-1824835, ZFL-1824837). Documents produced after the Court's ruling confirm that  
 16 the fighter compensation study was not undertaken in anticipation of litigation, as when, for example,  
 17 Mr. Campbell stated, [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]  
 19 [REDACTED]” Weiler Decl., Exh. 19 (ZFL-2701711). Mr. Campbell also stated,  
 20 [REDACTED]  
 21 [REDACTED] Weiler Decl., Exh. 20 (ZFL-  
 22 2701752).

23 These communications conveyed business advice rather than legal advice, and this Court has  
 24 held that they are not privileged. *Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist.  
 25 LEXIS 89293 (D. Nev. June 9, 2017). It is Zuffa's burden to establish that the material is privileged. *See,*  
 26 *In re Rivastigmine Patent Litig.*, 237 F.R.D. 69, 74 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (“It is axiomatic that the burden is on  
 27 a party claiming the protection of a privilege to establish those facts that are the essential elements of  
 28 the privileged relationship, a burden not discharged by mere conclusory or ipse dixit assertions.”). With

respect to such documents, if Zuffa maintains a privilege claim, Zuffa must detail the exact nature of the allegedly privileged communications in order for Plaintiffs to assess whether they constitute ordinary business communications or legal advice.

### **III. ZUFFA'S IMPROPER PRIVILEGE CLAIMS HAVE FRUSTRATED PLAINTIFFS' DISCOVERY AND PREJUDICED PLAINTIFFS.**

Plaintiffs have been prejudiced by Zuffa's belated productions of inadequate privilege logs, and its improper withholding or redaction of hundreds if not thousands of non-privileged relevant documents until the very end of the discovery period. Zuffa's strategy has left Plaintiffs with very little time to deal with a very significant problem. Plaintiffs have been denied relevant documents and have been forced to take depositions and develop expert testimony without the benefit of them. This is inconsistent with the basic principles underlying Rules 26 and 34, among others.

After motion practice before the Court and extensive negotiations with Zuffa, the parties have agreed to deposition dates for certain key witnesses, all of whom were actively involved in all aspects of Zuffa's business and played key roles in the anticompetitive activities alleged by Plaintiffs. Weiler Decl., ¶ 23. Each of these executives is identified as a sender, recipient, author or custodian of hundreds of documents in the privilege log, as the table<sup>4</sup> below makes clear:

Deponent/Title	Deposition Date	Documents
Michael Mersch	July 14	12,100
Kirk Hendrick	July 17-18	7,274
Lawrence Epstein	July 21	3,632
Dana White	August 9-10	499

Zuffa's proposal to provide additional descriptions for an uncertain number of documents by July 10—at which point judicial review is frustrated by the July 31 discovery cutoff—is unreasonable and unfair.

---

<sup>4</sup> Weiler Decl., ¶ 23.

#### IV. ARGUMENT

##### A. Legal Standard.

Rule 26 requires that a party asserting privilege must “describe the nature of the documents, communications, or tangible things not produced or disclosed—and do so in a manner that, without revealing information itself privileged or protected, will enable other parties to assess the claim”). Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5)(A). It is settled law that “[t]he privilege log must provide adequate descriptions of the document and the basis for claiming the privilege.” *RKF Retail Holdings, LLC v. Tropicana Las Vegas, Inc.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80436, at \*19 (D. Nev. May 25, 2017); *Bowne, Inc. v. AmBase Corp.*, 150 F.R.D. 465, 474 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (quotation marks and citation omitted) (“[T]he standard for testing the adequacy of the privilege log is whether, as to each document, it sets forth specific facts that, if credited, would suffice to establish each element of the privilege or immunity that is claimed.”). The party seeking to conceal discoverable material on the basis of privilege has the burden of providing sufficient information to justify the privilege claim. *Id.* (“The focus is on the specific descriptive portion of the log, and not on the conclusory invocations of the privilege or work-product rule, since the burden of the party withholding documents cannot be discharged by mere conclusory or *ipse dixit* assertions.”)

Courts routinely reject the sorts of vague and uninformative descriptions Zuffa offers here. *See Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, 151 F.R.D. 118, 122 n. 6 (D. Nev. 1993) (“General Electric’s log does not provide the names of intended recipients and others with access to the document, nor does it identify the documents or their subject matter with a reasonable degree of specificity.”); *Diamond State Ins. Co. v. Rebel Oil Co.*, 157 F.R.D. 691, 699 (D. Nev. 1994) (“self-serving conclusory statements” and a “a vague description of the documents” are insufficient to demonstrate a document is privileged). Boilerplate statements “are improper and therefore no claim of privilege at all.” *Miller v. Pancucci*, 141 F.R.D. 292, 302 (C.D. Cal. 1992) (citations omitted). Further, “[a] district court may require ‘individual explanations justifying the assertion of privilege.’” *Gashtili v. JB Carter Props. II, LLC*, No. 2:12-cv-00815-MMD-PAL, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 159076, at \*3 (D. Nev. Oct. 30, 2013) (quoting *Clarke v. Am. Commerce Nat’l Bank*, 974 F.2d 127, 129 (9th Cir. 1992) and ordering party to “particularize” the basis for its privilege claims or produce the disputed documents).

1 The privilege log must provide sufficient facts to show that the communications were made “for  
2 the purpose of obtaining or providing legal advice.” *Saud v. California*, No. 2:14-cv-2536 GEB AC, 2016  
3 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66238, at \*7 (E.D. Cal. May 18, 2016) (quoting *United States v. Chevron Texaco Corp.*,  
4 241 F. Supp. 2d 1065, 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2002)). Further, it must be shown that “the primary purpose of  
5 the communication was securing legal advice.” *Id.*

6 **B. Zuffa’s Late Production of an Inadequate Privilege Log Waives Its Privilege Claims.**

7 With respect to nearly all of the more than 30,000 purportedly privileged documents withheld  
8 or redacted, Zuffa has yet to provide detail that is sufficient under Rule 26. With respect to “nearly  
9 half” of these purportedly privileged documents, Zuffa refuses to revise its descriptions and intends to  
10 stand on its boilerplate descriptions.<sup>5</sup>

11 Given Zuffa’s intransigence and refusals to cure, with respect to all documents still withheld,  
12 Zuffa has forfeited its privilege claims by waiting more than two years to provide a sufficient description  
13 of the documents withheld. *See Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry.*, 408 F.3d at 1147-50. In considering  
14 whether a late or deficient privilege log waives privilege, courts in the Ninth Circuit analyze:

15 the degree to which the objection or assertion of privilege enables the  
16 litigant seeking discovery and the court to evaluate whether each of the  
17 withheld documents is privileged (where providing particulars typically  
18 contained in a privilege log is presumptively sufficient and boilerplate  
19 objections are presumptively insufficient); the timeliness of the objection  
20 and accompanying information about the withheld documents (where  
21 service within 30 days, as a default guideline, is sufficient); the magnitude  
22 of the document production; and other particular circumstances of the  
23 litigation that make responding to discovery unusually easy (such as, here,  
24 the fact that many of the same documents were the subject of discovery in  
25 an earlier action) or unusually hard.

26 *Id.* at 1149. The “holistic reasonableness analysis” discussed in *Burlington* supports waiver here.

27 First, Zuffa delayed nearly two years before making any attempt to substantiate the vague  
28 privilege and work product claims set forth in their Rule 34 responses to Plaintiffs’ document requests.  
The district court in *Burlington* found that a delay of five months was independently sufficient to waive

---

<sup>5</sup> As noted below, as to the other documents, Zuffa agrees to provide additional descriptions or to produce documents. Zuffa has not disclosed exactly how many documents fall into each category. Weiler Decl., Exh. 12.

1 privilege. 408 F.3d at 1149 (“In the absence of mitigating considerations, [a five-month delay] alone  
2 would immunize the district court’s ruling from reversal under the standard just articulated.”).

3 Second, as in *Burlington*, by providing only boilerplate descriptions that lack specifics (as  
4 discussed in greater detail below), Zuffa has made it very difficult—if not impossible—for Plaintiffs to  
5 conduct remaining discovery and evaluate Zuffa’s privilege claims. Descriptions such as “[e]mail chain  
6 providing legal advice regarding fighter contracts” leave Plaintiffs to guess at the true nature of the  
7 communication.

8 Third, as in *Burlington*, Zuffa has strategically delayed production and revision of the privilege  
9 log. For example, Zuffa produced no privilege log whatsoever when Plaintiffs conducted the first round  
10 of Rule 30(b)(6) depositions in November and December 2016. Zuffa then produced them in April,  
11 2017, so late as to make it virtually impossible to complete fact depositions of Zuffa’s personnel with the  
12 benefit of any meaningful challenge to the claims asserted in the privilege log. Plaintiffs were forced to  
13 take numerous depositions before and after April 2017, without the benefit of any privilege log. And  
14 now, Zuffa’s proposed schedule for revision follows the same pattern: Zuffa proposes to provide a  
15 revised privilege log by July 10, three days before the final scheduled status conference prior to the close  
16 of fact discovery.

17 Zuffa should not be permitted to use the voluminous nature of its document production as an  
18 excuse for its belated production of a privilege log to the prejudice of Plaintiffs. *See, Bullion Monarch*  
19 *Mining, Inc. v. Newmont USA Ltd.*, 271 F.R.D. 643, 649-50 (D. Nev. 2010) (holding that the defendant  
20 waived privilege for all documents in the privilege log, despite the “document-intensive” nature of the  
21 case, where the defendant “well knew that prompt document review and production of the documents  
22 and the log was of utmost importance and failed to take steps to insure that the privilege log would be  
23 produced until well past the time it could be of use to [the plaintiff]”). *Cf. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co. v.*  
24 *FDIC*, No. 2:12-cv-00665-KJD-PAL, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32654, at \*23 (D. Nev. Mar. 11, 2014)  
25 (“the magnitude of the production and the time needed to prepare fully compliant privilege logs weigh  
26 in favor of a finding of non waiver”). At a minimum, Zuffa should have disclosed the magnitude of its  
27 anticipated privilege claims and the timing of the production of a privilege log. *See Bullion Monarch*  
28 *Mining, Inc. v. Newmont USA Ltd.*, 271 F.R.D. 643, 649 (D. Nev. 2010) (“What is absent here is any



1 effort by Newmont to communicate with Bullion about the status of the privilege log, or to seek  
 2 assistance from the court to establish a realistic time frame to produce the privilege log”). As *Burlington*  
 3 recognizes, the Rule 26 privilege log should have been produced at the time of the document production  
 4 to head off the very problems Plaintiffs now face. *See Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry.*, 408 F.3d at 1147.  
 5 Although Zuffa’s document production may have been large, there is no excuse for Zuffa to fail to  
 6 provide sufficient detail in its April 2017 log, and to strategically delay the resolution of privilege issues  
 7 until the close of fact discovery. It is Zuffa’s privilege to protect, and it is Zuffa’s burden to follow well-  
 8 established procedures. Plaintiffs should not be prejudiced by Zuffa’s failure to do so.

9 **C. Zuffa’s Privilege Log Fails to Provide Sufficient Facts for Plaintiffs to Assess**  
 10 **Zuffa’s Claims of Privilege.**

11 In addition to failures to follow Rule 26 procedures, Zuffa’s privilege log is deficient. Zuffa’s  
 12 privilege log fails to provide sufficient factual bases for claiming privilege. Typical opaque descriptions  
 13 include: (1) “[e]mail chain providing legal advice regarding fighter contracts”; (2) “[e]mail providing  
 14 legal advice regarding acquisitions”; and (3) “[e]mail providing legal advice regarding corporate  
 15 matters.” Such descriptions do not satisfy Rule 26(b)(5)(A). A privilege log is insufficient when it “fails  
 16 to describe the claimed privileged information in a manner that would allow the Court to assess the  
 17 claim. . . .” *Phx. Ins. Co. v. Your Vitamins, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-00564-MMD-NJK, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 18 15479, at \*6 (D. Nev. Feb. 5, 2013) (ordering party to produce more detailed privilege log); *RKF Retail*  
 19 *Holdings, LLC*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80436, at \*19 (“A privilege log that merely states that the  
 20 document contains privileged analysis and reflects advice of counsel is vague and generic and does not  
 21 allow the court or the opposing party to adequately assess the claim of privilege.”)

22 Simply stating that the documents contain legal advice is insufficient. As the Court has found  
 23 here, “[I]n order for a communication that pertains to both business and legal advice to be considered  
 24 privileged, the ‘primary purpose’ must be to obtain or give legal advice.” *Cung Le v. Zuffa, LLC*, No.  
 25 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20614, at \*14 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2017) (quoting *Phillips*  
 26 *v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 290 F.R.D. 615, 628 (D. Nev. 2013)). This is especially so where the attorneys are in-  
 27 house counsel, because “communications involving in-house counsel might well pertain to business  
 28



1 rather than legal matters. The privilege does not protect an attorney’s business advice.” *United States v.*  
 2 *Chevron Texaco Corp.*, 241 F. Supp. 2d 1065, 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

3       Reviewing remarkably similar deficient entries, one court observed that “[n]either the Court nor  
 4 Plaintiffs can draw an accurate picture of these documents or what they may contain based on”  
 5 descriptions such as “Information prepared by counsel re: Aggregate data relating to product liability  
 6 claims’ . . . ‘Document prepared in anticipation of arbitration or litigation re: Aggregate data relating to  
 7 product liability claims for litigation strategy from outside counsel at Howrey.’” *In re Fluidmaster, Inc.*,  
 8 No. 1:14-cv-05696, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154618, at \*29-30 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 8, 2016) (“Fluidmaster’s  
 9 description of these documents on its privilege log is unhelpfully vague.”).

10       In order to focus the inquiry and to address burden concerns, as part of the meet and confer  
 11 process, Plaintiffs informed Zuffa that they are most concerned with reviewing Zuffa’s assertions of  
 12 privilege concerning fighter contracts (including negotiations), acquisition of other MMA promoters,  
 13 and documents described by Zuffa as relating to “corporate matters.” Weiler Decl., ¶ 11. Zuffa’s  
 14 privilege log contains 17,274 entries described only as relating to fighter contracts, acquisitions, or  
 15 corporate matters. *Id.* Although Zuffa has committed to review “approximately half” of the entries on  
 16 its log, Plaintiffs have no assurance that this will cover the more than seventeen thousand documents  
 17 that relate to these central topics.

#### 18       **D.       The Court Should Set a Procedure for Future Privilege Challenges.**

19       Working with limited information and boilerplate descriptions, Plaintiffs have already identified  
 20 a substantial number of documents that appear non-privileged. Plaintiffs have identified to Zuffa  
 21 approximately 140 documents that appear to be non-privileged, based on the un-redacted parts of the  
 22 documents that were disclosed to Plaintiffs. Weiler Decl., ¶ 12. Plaintiffs have identified a host of other  
 23 documents that are not privileged, including communications that appear to have been improperly  
 24 redacted. *Id.*, Exhs. 5, 8. Plaintiffs anticipate that once Zuffa provides revised descriptions for thousands  
 25 of other documents—as Zuffa is required to do under Rule 26—there will be other documents subject  
 26 to challenge.

As fact discovery is set to close on July 31, Zuffa should produce all non-privileged documents at once. In addition, Plaintiffs request that the Court allow Plaintiffs to conduct a meaningful challenge to documents Zuffa claims are privileged:

- Plaintiffs to provide list of challenged documents within five court days of receiving a privilege log with sufficient descriptions for the 17,274 entries that are the most relevant to Plaintiffs' claims;
- Zuffa to respond to specific challenged documents within five court days<sup>6</sup>;
- Plaintiffs to file motion to challenge remaining disputed documents within five court days (limited to 50 pages);
- Zuffa to file response within five court days;
- Plaintiffs to file any reply within three court days;
- The foregoing process to proceed beyond current discovery cut-off, if necessary; and,
- Depositions of Zuffa fact witnesses may be reopened to address improperly withheld documents subject to motion and showing of good cause.

## V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Zuffa has waived privilege by failing to provide a reasonable basis for Plaintiffs and the Court to evaluate the more than 30,000 entries on its belatedly produced privilege log. *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. v. United States Dist. Court*, 408 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 2005).

Alternatively, this Court should order Zuffa to (1) produce all non-privileged documents within five court days; (2) produce a revised privilege log that satisfies Rule 26; and (3) adopt Plaintiffs' above-detailed proposal for resolving any remaining disputes concerning documents withheld or redacted by Zuffa pursuant to claims of privilege.

---

<sup>6</sup> Plaintiffs would be amenable to using sampling techniques to address privilege claims. *See Vioxx Prods. Liab. Litig. Steering Comm. v. Merck & Co.*, 2006 U.S. App. LEXIS 27587, at \*8-10 (5th Cir. May 25, 2006); *see also In re Vioxx Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 501 F. Supp. 2d at 790-91.

1 DATED: June 30, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,  
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.

2  
3 By: /s/Joseph R. Saveri  
Joseph R. Saveri

4 Joseph R. Saveri (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
5 Joshua P. Davis (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
6 Matthew S. Weiler (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
7 Kevin E. Rayhill (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
8 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1210  
9 San Francisco, California 94111  
10 Phone: (415) 500-6800/Fax: (415) 395-9940  
jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
jdavis@saverilawfirm.com  
mweiler@saverilawfirm.com  
krayhill@saverilawfirm.com

11 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Classes and Attorneys for*  
12 *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan*  
*Quarry, Jon Fitch, Luis Javier Vazquez, Brandon Vera,*  
*and Kyle Kingsbury*

13 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL, PLLC  
14 Benjamin D. Brown (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
15 Richard A. Koffman (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
16 Daniel H. Silverman (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
17 1100 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 500, East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
18 Phone: (202) 408-4600/Fax: (202) 408-4699  
bbrown@cohenmilstein.com  
rkoffman@cohenmilstein.com  
dsilverman@cohenmilstein.com

19 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Classes and Attorneys for*  
20 *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan*  
*Quarry, Jon Fitch, Luis Javier Vazquez, Brandon Vera,*  
*and Kyle Kingsbury*

21 BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.  
22 Eric L. Cramer (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
23 Michael Dell'Angelo (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
24 Patrick Madden (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
1622 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
25 Phone: (215) 875-3000/Fax: (215) 875-4604  
ecramer@bm.net  
mdellangelo@bm.net  
pmadden@bm.net

26  
27 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Classes and Attorneys for*  
28 *Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan*  
*Quarry, Jon Fitch, Luis Javier Vazquez, Brandon Vera,*  
*and Kyle Kingsbury*

1 WOLF, RIFKIN, SHAPIRO,  
2 SCHULMAN & RABKIN, LLP  
3 Don Springmeyer  
4 Nevada Bar No. 1021  
5 Bradley S. Schrager  
6 Nevada Bar No. 10217  
7 Justin C. Jones  
8 Nevada Bar No. 8519  
9 3556 E. Russell Road, Second Floor  
10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89120  
11 (702) 341-5200/Fax: (702) 341-5300  
12 dspringmeyer@wrslawyers.com  
13 bschrager@wrslawyers.com  
14 jjones@wrslawyers.com

*Liaison Counsel for the Classes and Attorneys for  
Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan  
Quarry, Jon Fitch, Luis Javier Vazquez, Brandon Vera,  
and Kyle Kingsbury*

11 WARNER ANGLE HALLAM JACKSON &  
12 FORMANEK PLC  
13 Robert C. Maysey (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
14 Jerome K. Elwell (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
15 2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 800  
16 Phoenix, AZ 85016  
17 Phone: (602) 264-7101/Fax: (602) 234-0419  
18 rmaysey@warnerangle.com  
19 jelwell@warnerangle.com

*Counsel for the Classes and Attorneys for Individual and  
Representative Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, Jon  
Fitch, Luis Javier Vazquez, Brandon Vera, and Kyle  
Kingsbury*

19 LAW OFFICE OF FREDERICK S. SCHWARTZ  
20 Frederick S. Schwartz (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
21 15303 Ventura Boulevard, #1040  
22 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403  
23 Phone: (818) 986-2407/Fax: (818) 995-4124  
24 fred@fredschwartzlaw.com

*Attorney for Plaintiffs*

23 SPECTOR ROSEMAN KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.  
24 Jeffrey J. Corrigan (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
25 William G. Caldes (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
26 1818 Market Street – Suite 2500  
27 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
28 Phone: (215) 496-0300/Fax: (215) 496-6611  
jcorrigan@srkw-law.com  
wcaldes@srkw-law.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 30th day of June, 2017, true and correct copies of the documents listed below were served via the United States District Court CM/ECF system and electronic mail on all parties or persons requiring notice.

- **PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS WITHHELD ON PRIVILEGE GROUNDS AND FOR OTHER RELIEF**
- **DECLARATION OF MATTHEW S. WEILER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS WITHHELD ON PRIVILEGE GROUNDS AND FOR OTHER RELIEF**
- **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS WITHHELD ON PRIVILEGE GROUNDS AND FOR OTHER RELIEF**

By:

/s/ Kevin E. Rayhill  
Kevin E. Rayhill